

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEITH THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMIR, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:25-cv-00394-SAB (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE,
WITHOUT PREJUDICE

(ECF No. 7)

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for a scheduling conference, filed May 5, 2025.

On April 25, 2025, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1915, found no cognizable claims, and granted Plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 5.)

Plaintiff currently requests that Defendants file an answer to the complaint and seeks to settle this action. (ECF No. 7.) Plaintiff's motion must be denied as improper. Because Plaintiff has not stated a cognizable claim for relief and no Defendant has been ordered served, Plaintiff's motion for a scheduling conference and/or settlement is not consistent with the rules, and hence,

1 premature. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is denied.

2 IT IS SO ORDERED.

3 Dated: May 7, 2025



4
5 STANLEY A. BOONE
6 United States Magistrate Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28